

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants : Duo Deng et al.
Application No. : 10/713,552
Filed : November 14, 2003
For : TWO-LEVEL PROTECTION FOR UNINTERRUPTED POWER
SUPPLY

Examiner : Adi Amrany
Art Unit : 2836
Docket No. : 130209.513
Date : February 13, 2007

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Commissioner for Patents:

In response to the Examiner's Interview Summary dated January 31, 2007, please find the Applicants' Summary of the Interview between the Examiner and the Applicants' undersigned attorney, conducted on January 8, 2007:

Remarks begin on page 2 of this paper.

REMARKS

The Examiner and the Applicants' undersigned attorney conducted a telephonic interview on January 8, 2007, to discuss the rejections of the Non-Final Office Action mailed November 3, 2006. A brief summary of the interview is provided below.

1. Summary of the Interview

The Examiner initially interpreted the "first ON-Line mode" of *Janonis* (U.S. Patent 5,612,580) to require that both power sources (AC main and DC backup) are active to supply power to the load. *Janonis*, however, does not explicitly recite that the backup source is on during the first ON-Line mode. The *Janonis* first ON-Line mode only requires that the system stop charging the battery and begin to monitor the incoming power for sags and frequency deviations. The backup battery is only turned on once the input power drops below the second threshold (the *Janonis* "second ON-Line mode").


The interpretation of the claim language of providing power from "both" the power source and power supply was discussed. Applicants believe that the term "both" requires that both power sources (AC main and DC backup) are active to supply power to the load. However, it may be possible for the term "both" to have alternative interpretations, namely "either of the two" and "always two." In the event that the pending claims are not sufficiently distinguished over *Janonis*, the Examiner and Mr. Armentrout discussed the possibility of adding the limitation of "both at the same time" or "both concurrently" (or equivalent) to differentiate over *Janonis*, if necessary.

2. Conclusions

As a result of the Interview, Applicants filed a response on January 30, 2007, wherein the pending claims were *not amended* in view of the fact that *Janonis* does not explicitly recite that both power sources (AC main and DC backup) are on such that electrical power is commutated from both the power source and from the DC power supply to the DC bus when the DC bus voltage is intermediate the first and second thresholds, as recited, for example, in claim

19. Applicants did not amend the claims to avoid adding unnecessary limitations and await the Examiner's further consideration of the pending claims in view of the Interview.

Respectfully submitted,
SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC



Raymond W. Armentrout
Registration No. 45,866

RWA:jr

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400
Seattle, Washington 98104
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031

130209.513 / 904562_1.DOC